

REMARKS

Claims 29-38 and 40-59 are pending in this application.

Claims 29, 58 and 59 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 29, 58 and 59 do not introduce any new subject matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of (1) claims 29-36 and 40-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,610,822 ("Murphy") in view of International Application Pub. No. WO 00/38951 ("Mathias"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,300,880 ("Sitnik"); (2) claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Mathias and Sitnik as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,302 ("Berry"); and (3) claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Mathias and Sitnik as applied to claim 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,645 ("Moteki").

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest that at least one of the two wireless transmitters is an infrared transmitter transmitting the selected audio output on left and right frequencies, the left and right frequencies being different from each other and ranging from approximately 2.3 MHz to approximately 3.0 MHz, as essentially recited in amended claims 29, 58 and 59.

For example, referring to Fig. 1A, and paragraph 0063 of Applicants' disclosure, the two wireless transmitters 128 and 130 are infrared transmitters transmitting the selected audio output on different left and right frequencies, wherein the first left and right frequencies are 2.3 MHz and 2.8 MHz, respectively, and the second left and right

frequencies are 2.5 MHz and 3.0 MHz, respectively.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references, either alone, or in combination, disclose the claimed infrared transmitter transmitting the selected audio output in the specified frequency range. Further, Applicants submit that the specified frequency range is critical and not obtainable by routine experimentation for at least the reason that the frequencies were developed to address the specific situation of short-range wireless transmission of audio signals in a vehicle to more than one passenger.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants maintain that amended claims 29, 58 and 59 are patentable over the cited references.

For at least the reason that claims 2-38 and 40-57 depend from claim 29, claims 2-38 and 40-57 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 29-38 and 40-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888